

Introduction

[Parts of the World](#), [European Union](#)



Introduction Changing conceptions of the modern state inevitably provoke conflicting views of the term sovereignty. While some argue that the growing impact of cosmopolitan norms and transnationally-based governance are weakening state sovereignty, others claim that the concept is merely being redefined. Indeed, the latter group even includes proponents of global governance, who argue that state sovereignty can actually be strengthened rather than weakened by the transfer of power to the supranational level. In a bid to discuss on this question “ how correct is the view that the emergence of international organisations contributed to the waning sovereignty of states" you will agree with me that it is pertinent to have 1| P a ge a brief but detailed understanding of the key words such as sovereignty, states, international organisations. Definition of state Etymologically the state started to exist or emerge in the 15th century and because of the agreements of the Westphalia treaty of 1648 there arouse some basic features to what is to be called a state and such features are as follows 1. Distinct territory. 2. Sovereignty/ independence. 3. Population/ demography. 4. Government which must have authority and resource of physical power. Many political philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Machaveillie, Hobbes, John Locke, Max Weber, etc. even modern philosophers like Claude Ake have all tried to 2| P a ge give different and a befitting conception about what a state is or not. For the purpose of these work i shall just be looking at the concept of Max Weber, Plato, the social contract theorizers and that of Claude Ake. According to the fathers of philosophy Plato and Aristotle the state is seen as a system of service designed to meet the demands and challenges of the society. To Max Weber the state is a law unto itself that is the state is based

on law. To Thomas Hobbes it's an alternative to the brutish world that was in place before the social contract theory and therefore making security, order and peace the basis of the state. Claude Ake define the state as a specific modality of class domination and such modality of domination are autonomous i. e. the institutional mechanism of class 3| P a ge domination are constituted in way that they enjoy independence from the society such that they appear as an objective force standing alongside with society. We can also classify the conceptualization of the state into the liberal or bourgeoisies view and the Marxist views. The liberal proponents are of the view that the role of the state is to apply and mediate in the competitions and interrelationship. The state makes the rules of the competitions and interrelationship to facilitate the different classes to compete on a level playing ground. And such the state is seen as an unbiased umpire among the various competing class in the society. While the Marxist sees the state as a tool for the exploitation and oppressing of the civil society by the state officials i. e. it's the private property of the officials 4| P a ge or elites for self-advancement, and as such sees the states as a manifestation of the irreconcilable contraction among classes. And some major proponents of this view are Lenin and Karl Marx. To Lenin it is an organ of class rule, organ of the oppressive section of class by another; it is organized in the midst of class struggle or conflict by economically dominant class which becomes the most powerful political class. Karl Marx sees it as the executive committee of the bourgeois as a whole according to the Marxist perspective it exist to protect the dominant class in defence of private property and ownership. Having considered the above conception of various philosophers about what

a state is and the features of what makes up a state, we can now go ahead to discuss about the origin and meaning of sovereignty. 5| Page Indeed, the "flourishing" of international organisation resonates with the idea that the concept of sovereignty remains subject to clarification and interpretation. Due to the ambiguous nature of the term sovereignty the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, classified sovereignty into two which are the internal sovereignty and the external sovereignty. The internal sovereignty of state describes the relationship between the state and its people, including the monopoly on the use of force, while external sovereignty describes the relationship between several states, including the principle of non-interference. Krasner (1999), went further in subdividing the above classification into four which are: "interdependence sovereignty"; "domestic sovereignty", which can be classified under the internal sovereignty; "international legal sovereignty" and finally "Westphalian 6| Page sovereignty", which can also be classified under external security. Brief history of International Organisation International organisation can be defined as the coming together of various or different nations to form a unified body (i. e. a body that cut across nationality) where by each member have agreed to abide by certain laid down rules and regulation that are written and documented for the purpose of fostering, promoting peace, unity, political security, economic security, growth and development among member states. The origin of international organisation can be traced as far back to 300bc and by the 478bc the Greek city states established the Delian league to bring about a unified response to treat Persia, also The Council of Constancy was created in 1414 to treat and resolve the 7| Page claims to

papacy this was the first international congress in history. Then came the Westphalia treaty of 1648 which brought about a notable mile stone in the history of international organisation Many scholars of international relation are of the opinion that the origin of the international organisations, international system of states and multinational corporations can be traced back to the Westphalia treaty of 1648 which preceded the Gabasianism, these treaty sees sovereignty has been based on two principles which are the principles of territoriality and exclusion of external factors from domestic authority as discussed earlier. After the 1648 Westphalia treaty there came various treaties and league ranging from the Hansectic league which was formed around the Middle Ages to aid the growth of trade among the then European countries another notable example was the Hague league etc. since 8| P a ge then we have also had various leagues, treaties, peace talks among various nationals till date. In summary we can postulate three major reasons for the establishment of international organisation which are: 1. The belief in a community of human kind i. e. universality of human kind through international organisations. 2. Big power peace keeping i. e. the powerful countries is bestowed with the responsibility to preserve peace and cooperation among member states. 3. Pragmatic cooperation: the increasing complexity and inter-twin war as necessitated the creation of specialized agencies to deal with specific economic and social problems. 9| P a ge

Impact of International Organisation on States Sovereignty This important question (“ how correct is the view that the emergence of international organisations contributed to the waning sovereignty of states”) has always been a bandied one in any political discourse, which its terms are often

misinterpreted, and each of them could serve as a subject for extensive discussion, although I will limit myself to the concept of sovereignty and the important meaning we attach to that word. In my opinion, there has been a lack of open discussion on the concept of sovereignty in the context of the trends of recent decades in global co-operation. I welcome this opportunity to discuss this fundamental issue in the discourse on international organisation and co-operation. At the same time, I would like to use this opportunity to 10 | P a g e appreciate my admirable lecturer Dr Etemike Laz who has given us the opportunity to attempt a debate of this nature. The sovereignty of a state which provided exciting opportunities naturally also entailed a framework of restrictions designed to secure it, these framework are based on the environment and views of the time in question. This discussion must be wider scale in order to give my readers and the public a clear view of the various obligations by which modern states are bound, undertakings rising out of international agreements and obligations grounded in the general rules of international law. In a bid understand these work, the basic question that I will attempt to answer here is what is involved in the 11 | P a g e concept of sovereignty. According to one of the definitions of sovereignty under international law, a community of people is sovereign if it controls land, is self-governing and recognised by other states as a sovereign state. The recognition entitles a nation to participate in the community of sovereign states with all the attached rights and obligations. of This entails the right to and membership international organisations participation in bilateral or multilateral treaties with other sovereign nations. A sovereign state thus has the right to decide its own affairs without

interference from other states. It can decide its own constitution, form of government, administrative and other legislation, with the exclusive right to enforce such legislation within its territory. However, the powers of a sovereign state in this respect 12 | Page are limited by the rules of international law, whether such rules originate in treaties or general principles of international law. To give an example, human rights are recognised as principles of international law and are therefore not interpreted on the basis of local conditions or internal legal order. Sovereign nations are bound to observe these rules with respect to their citizens and other nations are permitted to intervene in the human rights affairs of other nations. Sovereign nations can enter into agreements among themselves without thereby disrupting their status in the community of nations. States can negotiate on the assignment of certain aspects of government, e. g. to international organisations, but this does not mean that the state is no longer sovereign. In such circumstances I think it is more appropriate to say that a state is sharing part of its sovereignty with other states on a reciprocal 13 | Page basis. if we want to analyze the effects of international legalization on state sovereignty, it might be best to distinguish the role the latter plays in three different contexts i. e. the impact of international organization on sovereignty which are as follows 1) In the context of international relations theory, for example, sovereignty is used as an analytical concept, 2) In the context of international law, sovereignty is a legal norm, which defines rights and duties of states, and 3) In the context of political debate, sovereignty is used to assess the freedom of action of a government. 14 | Page To begin, sovereignty as an analytical concept is

fundamental to understanding the composition of an anarchic international system. According to Waltz's theory of structural realism, state sovereignty is safeguarded because states are not subject to a higher or 'superior' authority. This allows states to act freely so long as they are not restrained by other states. So the multitude of global legal mechanisms and norms does not affect the validity of sovereignty as an analytical concept as long as legalization falls short of bringing about a world government. In fact, a stereotypical Realist would argue that legalization does not change anything about world politics because laws only perpetuate the power of the already powerful. Second, sovereignty as an international legal norm arose with the Treaty of Westphalia's (1648) formalized emphasis on its internal and external forms. External sovereignty, for example, safeguarded against outside interference in the internal affairs of states. Rulers were free to regulate the relationship between themselves and their people without external interference. Internal sovereignty, on the other hand, meant that a ruler enjoyed a monopoly of power. Yet the concept of sovereignty changed as monarchies were overthrown and replaced by republics and democracies. Sovereignty became national conditional consensus. upon But electoral despite processes the transfer and of sovereignty from individual rulers to whole citizenries, the concept did not lose its meaning in the process. In representative systems of government, sovereignty remains delegated to elected representatives. (By the way, a similar process seems to be underway today at the international level. States delegate certain aspects of their sovereignty to formal mechanisms of global governance. Understood in this way, sovereignty per se is not challenged by international

organization/ legalization - only its meaning might be changed. Accordingly, a collision between international law and state sovereignty is not logically possible. International law established supranational conceptions of sovereignty and it can also facilitate its abolishment, should states wish to exercise this option.) The third and final meaning of sovereignty is that of a measure of political practice. Sovereignty is about states acting independently and autonomously. Yet sovereignty in this context is difficult to quantify. Sovereignty is often used in political discourse, for example, to determine whether a state or society has gained or lost autonomy of action. Now, one can argue that while international 17 | Page politics is being legalized, states have lost autonomy. It would be difficult, however, to establish a causal link between legalization and loss of sovereignty in its third meaning. Is sovereignty not rather limited by the growing global interdependence which precedes the increasing density of international laws? Societies where the rule of law is firmly established will understand that an increased density of laws can actually enhance autonomy rather than limit it. The same may be true at the international level: the legalization of international relations may actually help states regain some of the autonomy they have lost in the wake of increasing interdependence. Nevertheless, we should be prepared to hear certain actors continue to lament the loss of sovereignty. Recalling the domesticinternational nexus in legalization, as pointed out by 18 | Page Haines, we notice that such a lament may just be indicative of a domestic actor losing power. We can be quite sure, the creators of International Organization may tell us, there is at least another one gaining. It will be paramount to have at the back of our mind that only

sovereign states can become parties to international organisations. The states become participants and consent to abide by the rules of such organisations on certain matters for as long as they remain members. Their participation is based on the rules of international law, and therefore has no impact on their status as sovereign nations. Exemplary Trends on the Impact of International Organisation on States Sovereignty To buttress my argument on this debate I will be taking a look at some exemplary trends among 19 | P a g e international organisation in international affairs and their efforts in the maintenance of peace, protecting its member's sovereignty etc. In many ways, the history of the world is the history of war. Two world wars separated by a short interval in the last century were the last straw; setting in motion a trend for states to take up close co-operation among themselves on common interests that they believed would ensure security and balance in the co-existence of nations. Among the organisations to grow from this soil were the United Nations (UN), the Council of Europe, Northern European Atlantic Treaty Organisation Union (NATO), and (EU). The United Nations play an important role for peace and stability in the world. The role of the UN has been expanded gradually in the course of time, and the organisation itself together with its agencies now 20 | P a g e performs a key role in various areas affecting the daily lives of most people without their being aware of it. Cases in point include the work of the UN on health, refugees and human rights. It has also been long recognised that the driving force of the world economy is trade. Many states are entirely dependent on international trade. It should not have come as a surprise, therefore, that the trend I discussed earlier led to co-operation and subsequently the establishment of alliances

between states centring on trade and economic affairs. These organisations include GATT (General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade) and OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). In this regard it has been clear for a long time that co-ordinated rules are essential in international trade in order to secure a level ground for all. This is the reason for the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), which is built on the foundations of GATT. In the co-operation within the WTO, a country will not be bound by the rules of the Organisation without first approving them. However, as in the case of any other organisation, it would not be tolerated if the country intended only to reap the benefits of the co-operation and not share any of the burdens with the other member states through the use of collective security theory. Thus, a country has by joining this co-operation curtailed our own powers to increase custom duties or subsidise agriculture, and we have also consented to permit the import of agricultural products to some extent. From another perspective, the interests of small states in the existence of the WTO is considerably greater than the interests of larger nations, as open global trade is so important to us. Larger states can, on the basis of their influence, attain their objectives by other means without recourse to international organisations. The same is true for various other aspects of international co-operation. Thus, international co-operation often provides a basis for access by smaller states to the playing field of the larger states. It is interesting to note in this context that a decision was passed in the WTO sometimes ago where certain tax incentives provided by the United States to export companies were declared inconsistent with WTO rules. A decision of this kind is obviously significant for

smaller countries which are engaged in global competition with U. S. exporters. A decision of this kind would never have been achieved without the existence of an international organisation like the WTO. The development and expansion of international cooperation has progressed steadily. It is becoming increasingly clear to the countries of the world that there 23 | P a g e is no way for them to solve various problems without cooperation, indeed, without sharing their sovereign powers. The clearest example of this now is no doubt the environment, as it is now obvious to all the countries of the world that pollution has no respect for borders. It is no use for a country to say its combating pollution of the sea or overfishing except in co-operation with other nations, also the coming together of nations under the umbrellas of various international organisations to look for possible way to ratifying the issue of global warming. By the same token there is an increased tendency to channel the struggle against international crime into a joint effort where a group of states agrees on systematic measures in the struggle against the criminals. We can see signs of this tendency both within the EU African Union and also in the United Nations. We have recently been harshly reminded how important it is for us to work 24 | P a g e together in this area, and the reaction to the recent acts of terror in the United States shows us in a nutshell how the international community is working together in this area. The trends I have been describing have had great impact in many small countries. Nigeria is currently a member of over fifty international organisations and institutions, and within these organisations and institutions decisions are made which have a direct impact on our daily lives and Nigeria as a nation has benefitted surroundings. from

these international organisations in various ways such as in the fight of epidemic diseases such as malaria, relief funds, fighting corruption such as

In September 2005, Nigeria, with the assistance of the World Bank, began to recover over US\$700 million of illicit funds that had been deposited in Swiss banks by the late military dictator 25 | P a g e Sani Abacha, who ruled Nigeria from 1993 to 1998, also By 1974, the United States had provided Nigeria with approximately \$360 million in assistance, which included grants for technical assistance, development assistance, relief and rehabilitation, and food aid and many more ways Nigerian as country as benefited from the impacts of international organisation. It becomes clear that the impact of international organisation are inseparable in the running of the nation affair due to her constant plea for assistance both financially, technologically, from the international community. Conclusion Having examined the impact of international organisations as analyzed above we come to an agreement with Goldstein, et al (2000), and Haines (2010), on state sovereignty, where we find out that the 26 | P a g e latter(international organisation) is hardly compromised by the former(sovereignty). The utility of sovereignty as an analytical tool in certain theories of international relations is not reduced. Neither can we talk of a collision between legalization and sovereignty in the second, legal sense of the term. The delegation of sovereignty to supranational organizations in certain areas does not abolish sovereignty per se. Thirdly, there will, of course, always be people who lament the loss of sovereignty, understood as national autonomy, in the political debate. However, a causal link between legalization and loss of national autonomy is difficult to establish. It may well be argued that the legalization of

international politics gives states back some of the autonomy they have lost in the course of globalization. In other words, legalization(international oraganisation) may help states regain sovereignty. 27 | P a g e Overall, states determine the potential usefulness (and arguably effectiveness) of institutions based on possible relative gains. Institutions thus matter to the degree that states benefit from them. If cooperation in institutions led to erosion of state sovereignty, states would not choose to participate in them. Furthermore, transnational relations between states flourish because of state sovereignty not in spite of sovereignty as states facilitate agreements and their implementation (Gilpin 1981). If states determine how and when institutions matter, then states only relinquish sovereignty to the degree that they will receive relative gains. Realists allow that institutions matter when states see fit: herein lies the possibility of admitting that NGOs can positively impact state sovereignty though realists do not venture here. So helped in to conclusion maintain the and international build the organization 28 | P a g e sovereignty of its members than in its reduction due to its positive imparts it had on their economy. REFERENCES Steven Haines , 2010, A Bright Future for International Law? , GCSP Policy Paper, Sovereignty, in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy , Stephen D Krasner, 1999. www. en/wikipedia. org/wiki/economy_of_nigeria And finally, see the summer 2000 issue of International Organization (Vol 54, No 3), which focuses on the topic of Legalization and World Politics. In particular, see the Introduction by J Goldstein, M. Kahler, R O Keohane and A M Slaughter. 29 | P a g e Further readings The Impact of International Co-operation on Sovereignty by Halldor Asgrimsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs

of Iceland Rethinking the Nation-State: The Many Meanings of Sovereignty
Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec 1999. by Joseph Joffe, The article on Legalized
Dispute Resolution: Interstate and Transnational, by R O Keohane, A
Moravcsik, A M Slaughter; The article on Legalization as Strategy: The Asia-
Pacific Case, by Miles Kahler; And the Conclusion: The Causes and
Consequences of Legalization, also by Kahler. 30 | P a g e